

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/743,110	12/23/2003	Norikazu Arai	02860.0637-06	8016
22852 75	22852 7590 06/02/2006		EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			CHU, KIM KWOK	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2627	
			DATE MAILED: 06/02/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		* *					
Office Action Summary		10/743,110	ARAI ET AL.				
	Office Action Guillinary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	Kim-Kwok CHU	2627				
Period fo	• •	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	CRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAISIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amer	ndments filed on 3/31/06 and 4/1	<u>7/06</u> .				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1,7,8,77,84,85,135 and 136</u> is/are rejection(s) <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> is/are objected Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration. ected. ed to.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on <u>23 December 2003</u> is/a	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ object	ed to by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P1O-152.				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No. <u>09/487,928</u> . ed in this National Stage				
Attachmen		_					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) 🔯 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Claim Objections

- 1. Claims 77 and 140 are objected to because of the following informalities:
- (a) in claim 77, line 14, the term "passes through the diffractive portion" should be changed to --passes through the first diffractive portion--; and
- (b) in the newly added claim 140, line 1, the term "The objective lens of 97" should be changed to --The objective lens of claim 96-- because claim 97 has been cancelled.

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 3. Claims 1, 7, 8, 135 and 136 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,870,805. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.
- 4. With respect to the present claims 1, 135 and 136, the '805 patent's claim 1 has every limitation of the present claims 1, 135 and 136 except the following amended feature "where the n of the first n-th ordered diffracted ray is equal to the n of the second n-th ordered diffracted ray". This is an obvious limitation because the "n" used in the

'805 patent is commonly assigned to label various order diffracted rays of the first light flux and the second light flux such as n is zero, n is ± one etc.

- 5. With respect to the present claim 7, the '805 patent's claim 1 has every limitation of the present claim 7 except the following amended feature " $\lambda 1 < \lambda 2$, and t1 < t2". This is an obvious limitation because a shorter wavelength such as 635 nm is used on a thin recording medium such as a DVD which is 0.6 mm.
- 6. With respect to the present claim 8, the '805 patent's claim 1 has every limitation of the present claim 8 except the following amended feature "NA1 > NA2". This is an obvious limitation because a larger number aperture such as NA1 is 0.8 for a higher density recording medium (DVD) and a smaller numerical aperture such as NA2 is 0.45 is for lower density recording medium (CD-ROM).
- 7. Claims 77, 84 and 85 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,870,805. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

- 8. With respect to the present claim 77, the '805 patent's claim 19 has every limitation of the present claim 77.
- 9. With respect to the present claim 84, the '805 patent's claim 19 has every limitation of the present claim 84 except the following amended feature " $\lambda 1 < \lambda 2$, and t1 < t2". This is an obvious limitation because a shorter wavelength such as 635 nm is used on a thin recording medium such as a DVD which is 0.6 mm.
- 10. With respect to the present claim 85, the '805 patent's claim 19 has every limitation of the present claim 85 except the following amended feature "NA1 > NA2". This is an obvious limitation because a larger number aperture such as NA1 is 0.8 for a higher density recording medium (DVD) and a smaller numerical aperture such as NA2 is 0.45 is for lower density recording medium (CD-ROM).

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 9, 10, 13-15, 19, 25, 26, 50, 62, 65, 68, 76, 86, 87, 90-92, 96, 102, 113, 114, 128, 134 and 137-140 are objected to as being dependent upon rejected claims based on obvious double patenting, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Kim CHU whose telephone number is (571) 272-7585 between 9:30 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch, can be reached on (57) 272-7589.

The fax number is:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communications intended for entry. Or:

(571) 273-7585, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished application is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9191 (toll free).

THANG/V. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Kim-Kwok CHU

Examiner AU2627 May 26, 2006

5/26/06

(571) 272-7585

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-326)

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1,7-10,13-15,19,25,26,50,62,65,68,76,77,84-87,90-92,96,102,113,114,128 and 134-140.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims objected to are 9,10,13-15,19,25,26,50,62,65,68,76,86,87,90-92,96,102,113,114,128,134 and 137-140.